

against those claims either be withdrawn or that a subsequent office action detail where the claimed features may be found in the cited references so Applicants have a fair opportunity to rebut the outstanding rejections.

Applicants also take issue with the assertion that Gullett inherently teaches cleaning a removed filter element before returning the same to the filter assembly. Applicants respectfully assert that the difference between a metallic filter screen element and a conventional filter element is the former may be washed, whereas those with ordinary skill in the art would recognize that disposal and replacement is the only suitable alternative with regard to conventional filter elements. Therefore, the supposed inherent understanding asserted in the office action is not supported by any evidence of record and is in fact contrary to the inherent understanding in the art. Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejections against the method claims should further be withdrawn or that the Examiner should make evidence of record to prove the supposed inherency finding in the office action.

This application is now believed to be in condition for allowance of claims 1-9 and 11-14. However, if the Examiner believes that some minor additional clarification would put this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at (812) 333-5355 in order to hasten the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully Submitted,



Michael B. McNeil  
Reg. No. 35,949